

### REMARKS

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,553 to Panasik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,865 to Veerasamy. Claims 2, 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,617,102 to Prater. Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of GB 2,149,554 to William. Claims 28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,647 to Sato. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of Prater. Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of William. Claim 19 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In accordance with the present response, allowable claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form to include all

of the limitations of base claim 15. Claims 2, 17 and 29 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 23 has been amended to further patentably distinguish from the prior art of record. New claims 34-44 have been added to provide a fuller scope of coverage. The title of the invention has been changed to "INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM, INFORMATION PROCESSING METHOD, AND COMPUTER-READABLE RECORDING MEDIUM FOR EXECUTING THE INFORMATION PROCESSING METHOD ON A COMPUTER" to more clearly reflect the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of their application in light of the following discussion.

**Traversal of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 2, 17 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner contends that the recitation "a remaining charge of a battery of the first information processing device" is unclear. Applicants respectfully traverse this contention.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 17 and 29 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, which, in relevant part, provides:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The "distinctly claiming" requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph means that the claims must have a clear and definite meaning when construed in light of the complete patent document. Miles Laboratories, Inc. v. Shandon, Inc., 27 USPQ2d 1123, 1126 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In the specification (page 13, lines 2-9) and Fig. 4, applicants disclose an embodiment of the information processing system recited in the claims where data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device corresponds to a remaining battery charge (battery symbol 401), a communication state (antenna symbol 402), and current date, day and time.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the language of each of claims 2, 19 and 29 "particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention", as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. When read in light of the complete patent document, as directed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the language of claims 2, 19 and 29 is without any ambiguity.

Nevertheless, in the spirit of advancing prosecution, claims 2, 19 and 29 have been amended to recite that the information processing system further comprises a battery for supplying power to the first information processing device, and that the data information displayed by

the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of the battery.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2, 17 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **Brief Summary of the Invention**

The present invention is directed to an information processing system, an information processing method, and a computer-readable recording medium for executing the information processing method on a computer.

As described in the specification (pages 1-2), conventional information processing devices, such as portable telephones, have very small display screens due to the requirement for miniaturization of these devices. As a result, the amount of information that can be displayed in the display screens of conventional portable information processing devices is limited. Furthermore, with a portable telephone, it is very difficult to view the display screen during a phone conversation when the portable telephone is in contact with the user's ear.

The present invention overcomes the drawbacks of the conventional art. Figs. 1-2 show an embodiment of an

information processing system according to the present invention embodied in the claims. The information processing system has a first information processing device 100 having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display 110 for displaying the data information. A second information processing device 101 has a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device 100 by wireless communication and a display 120 for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display 110 of the first information processing device 100.

In one embodiment, the data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device 101 corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of a battery of the first information processing device 100 (e.g., battery symbol 401 in Fig. 4). In another embodiment, the data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device 101 corresponds to information relating to an ongoing communication state between the first information processing device 100 and an external device (e.g., antenna symbol 402 in Fig. 4).

In another aspect, as illustrated in the flowchart of Fig. 3, the present invention is directed an information

processing method utilizing the information processing system of the present invention as described above. In yet another aspect, the present invention is directed to a computer-readable recording medium for storing a program for processing a computer to execute the information processing method according to the present invention.

By the foregoing information processing system and method according to the present invention, the content of a display of a first information processing device can be easily confirmed by viewing the display of a second information processing device, particularly when it is difficult to view the display of the first information processing device.

#### **Traversal of Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik and Veerasamy do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an information processing system and requires a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by

wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information, and a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device. No corresponding structural combination is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Independent claim 8 is directed to an information processing method and requires the steps of providing a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a first display for displaying the data information, providing a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator and a second display, and operating the second information processing device so that the second wireless communicator receives data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and the second display displays data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the first display. No corresponding combination of steps is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Independent claim 15 is directed to an information processing system and requires a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information, a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying information, and display control means for controlling the display of the second information processing device to display data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device. Again, no corresponding structural combination is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

The primary reference to Panasik discloses a low power wireless network in which a first calculator 14 (first information processing device) is able to communicate with a second calculator 18 (second information processing device) by transmission via a distributed antenna system 40. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Panasik does not disclose that any of the first and second calculators 14, 18 has a wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication, as required by each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Likewise, since



Panasik does not disclose a first information processing device for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication, Panasik also does not disclose that the first information processing device has a display for displaying the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station, and a second information processing device having a display for displaying the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device, as required by each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Thus, wireless network disclosed by Panasik does not disclose the following three components of the information processing system (claims 1, 15) and method (claim 8) required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15:

(1) A first information processing device having a wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication;

(2) A display of the first information processing device for displaying the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station; and

(3) A second information processing device having a display for displaying the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device (i.e., since the display of the first information device displays the

data information which is received and sent from and to the base station, claims 1, 8 and 15 also require that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device is also data information which is received and sent from and to the base station).

The secondary reference to Veerasamy discloses a cellular telephone system which prioritizes calls to have a low, regular or high priority in order to increase the efficiency of reserved channel usage. Veerasamy discloses communication between mobile subscriber units 10A, 10B and one or more of base stations 14A, 14B. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Veerasamy's wireless communication system into Panasik's wireless network in order to "provide a high priority channel that can be ended if a high priority mobile communication device needs to use the priority channel. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention.

First, it is not understood how the Examiner proposes to modify Panaski's wireless network to incorporate Veerasamy's wireless communication system and how such modification would result in the specific information processing system (claims 1, 15) and method (claim 8) recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. For example, which specific elements and/or features of Veerasamy's wireless

communication system does the Examiner propose to incorporate into Panaski's wireless network ? How would the base stations disclosed by Veerasamy's interact with the calculators and/or computers disclosed by Panasaki so as to result in a communication system which prioritizes calls to have a low, regular or high priority ? There is simply no teaching basis in the two references to guide one skilled in the art to incorporate Veerasamy's wireless communication system into Panaski's wireless network.

Second, the proposed combination of Panasik and Veerasamy is improper because the prior art teaches away from the claimed combination. A reference teaches away when a person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that the applicant took. In re Gurley, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Stated otherwise, a reference teaches away if it suggests that the line of development falling from the reference's disclosure is unlikely to be productive of the result sought by applicants. W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 311 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (the totality of a reference's teachings must be considered), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984); In re Caldwell, 138, USPQ 243, 245 (CCPA 1969) (reference teaches away if it leaves the impression that the product would not have the properties sought by the applicant).

In this case, the prior art teaches away from the claimed combination because Panasik deals with a low power wireless network using a distributed antenna system which may be formed in conjunction with a ceiling, floor tiles, modular office components, or student desks (see abstract). A primary object of Panasik's wireless network is to provide the distributed antenna system for the purpose of significantly reducing the power used by a portable computer or other mobile computing electronic device (col. 2, lines 54-59). In contrast, Veerasamy deals with a high power wireless communication system in which a cellular communication network prioritizes access to channel assignments. Thus, the Examiner's proposed modification of Panasik in view of Veerasamy would presumably require the replacement of Panasik's low power wireless network with a high power wireless network that will not use or require the distributed antenna system of Panasik, which is contrary to the express teaching in Panasik. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's contention, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been led by the teachings of the references to incorporate Veerasamy's wireless communication system into Panasik's wireless network.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that even if it were proper to modify Panasik in view of Veerasamy as proposed by the Examiner, the proposed modification would not

result in the claimed invention. More specifically, assuming that the Examiner's proposed combination of Panasik and Veerasamy would teach components (1) and (2) as set forth above for independent claims 1, 8 and 15, the resulting combination does not teach component (3) required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Stated otherwise, even if upon modification of Panasik in view of Veerasamy, as proposed by the Examiner, the first information processing device (e.g., one of the computers or calculators) of Panasik has a wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication (component (1)) and a display for displaying the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station (component (2)), the resulting combination will not provide a second information processing device having a display for displaying the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device (component 3)), as required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Stated otherwise, since the display of the first information device displays the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station, component (3) of claims 1, 8 and 15 requires that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device is also data information which is received and sent from and to the base station. The Examiner's proposed combination of Panasik and

Veerasamy does not result in a second information processing device having a display for displaying data information which is received and sent to and from the base station, as required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to modify Panasik in view of Veerasamy in the manner proposed by the Examiner in the statement of rejection. The only basis for the combinations urged by the Examiner in the rejection is applicants' own disclosure, and such hindsight rejections are improper. See, for example, Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Geiger, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987); Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co., 227 USPQ 337, 343 (Fed. Cir. 1985); Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

In order to support a claim rejection based upon obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must provide an evidentiary basis establishing the obviousness of each modification. The Examiner may do this by citing a reference which directly establishes this obviousness, or, the Examiner may otherwise set forth a line of reasoning consistent with and motivated by the cited art establishing that such modifications would have been obvious. Mere speculation or conclusory allegations are simply inadequate to meet this burden. There must be some teaching, reason, suggestion, or

motivation found in the prior art references to make a combination which renders an invention obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C §103. See, e.g., Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Opticon, Inc., 935 F.2d 982, 989, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In order to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must not only demonstrate that this teaching exists in the prior art, but that it would teach all limitations of the claim. This burden cannot be met by citing references that, even if combined, fail to teach explicitly recited limitations.

Stated otherwise, in rejecting a claim as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner cannot simply rely on a combination of references that teach some limitations of the claim, and make mere conclusory allegations that the combination teaches others as well.

In the instant case, the Examiner has not met his burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness as discussed above.

As noted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in the case of In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992):

'Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.'

Although couched in terms of combining teachings found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a purported obvious 'modification' of the prior art. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. Wilson and Hendrix fail to suggest any motivation for, or desirability of, the changes espoused by the Examiner and endorsed by the Board.

Here, the Examiner relied upon hindsight to arrive at the determination of obviousness. It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. This court has previously stated that '[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.'

As further noted by the Federal Circuit in In re Oeticker, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992):

The prima facie case is a procedural tool of patent examination, allocating the burdens of going forward as between examiner and applicant. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 707 n.3, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 n.3 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The term 'prima facie case' refers only to the initial examination step. In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 1052, 189 USPQ 143, 147 (CCPA 1976). As discussed in In re Piasecki, the examiner bears the initial burden, on review of the prior art or on any other ground, of presenting a prima facie case of unpatentability. If that burden is met, the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shifts to the applicant.



\* \* \*

If examination at the initial stage does not produce a prima facie case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of the patent. See In re Grabiak, 769, F.2d 729, 733, 226 USPQ 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Rinehart, supra.

In reviewing the examiner's decision on appeal, the Board must necessarily weigh all of the evidence and argument. An observation by the Board that the examiner made a prima facie case is not improper, as long as the ultimate determination of patentability is made on the entire record. In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d at 1472, 223 USPQ at 788; In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d at 1052, 189 USPQ at 147.

The Federal Circuit has therefore made it clear that the prior art must show an incentive to modify its teachings in order to render a claim obvious. Without such an incentive, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be made.

Claims 3, 6, 21-24, 26, 27 and 10 and 18 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 1, 8 and 15.

Moreover, there are separate grounds for patentability of several of the dependent claims.

Claims 3 and 18 include the additional limitation that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to an ongoing communication state between

the first information processing device and the base station. Contrary to the Examiner's contention, this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Veerasamy. More specifically, as disclosed by Veerasamy (col. 3, lines 21-31), a mobile subscriber unit 10A (information processing device) can place a call via a channel 12A to a base station 14A. After originating a call by placing a number into an origination register of the mobile unit 10A, a request for service is sent on a selected set-up channel by the mobile unit 10A to the base station 14A. The base station 14A then sends a request to a mobile switching center 16A. There is simply no disclosure in Veerasamy that a display of the second information processing device displays data information corresponding to information relating to an ongoing communication state between the first information processing device and the base station, as required by claims 3 and 18.

Claim 6 includes the additional limitation that the information processing system further comprises mounting means for mounting the second information processing device on a person's arm. Likewise, claim 24 includes the additional limitation that at least one of the first and second information processing devices has a band for mounting the information processing device on a person's arm. No corresponding features are disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. For example, contrary to the Examiner's

contention, col. 3, lines 35-67 in Panasik does not provide any disclosure relating to any means for mounting the information processing device on a person's arm. Panasik discloses information processing devices in the form of calculators or portable computers, but does not disclose any means for mounting such calculators or portable computers on a person's arm.

Claim 10 includes the additional limitation that the data information displayed by the first display comprises first level information, and that the operating step comprises displaying with the second display second level information corresponding to a sub-level of the first level information. Likewise, amended claim 23 includes the additional limitation that the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device comprises first level information, and that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device comprises second level information corresponding to a sub-level of the first level information. The subject matter recited in claims 10 and 23 corresponds to the subject matter of allowable claim 19 which, as acknowledged by the Examiner, is not taught by the prior art of record. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's contention, the subject matter recited in claims 10 and 23 are most definitely not disclosed in Figs. 1a, 1b, the abstract and col. 3, lines 35-67 of Panasik.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of Prater. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik, Veerasamy and Prater do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 2, 17 and 25.

Panasik in view of Veerasamy does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 1 and 15 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 2, 25 and 17 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 15, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 1 and 15.

Moreover, each of amended claims 2 and 17 includes the additional limitation that the information processing system further comprises a battery for supplying power to the first information processing device, and that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to a

remaining charge of the battery. No corresponding features are disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

The secondary reference to Prater has been cited by the Examiner only for its disclosure of a communications transceiver in which information relating to a remaining charge of a battery of a processing device is displayed. However, Prater clearly does not disclose or suggest that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of the battery of the first information processing device. Stated otherwise, while Prater discloses the display of information relating to a remaining charge of a battery, there is no teaching basis in the reference to guide one skilled in the art to use a display of one information processing device to display the remaining charge of the battery of another information processing device, as required by claims 2 and 17. Since Prater does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 2 and 17, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of Prater to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of Prater be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of William. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik, Veerasamy and William do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 11 and 16.

Panasik in view of Veerasamy does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 8 and 15 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 11 and 16 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claims 8 and 15, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 8 and 15.

The secondary reference to William has been cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of a computer readable recording medium for storing a program for processing a computer to execute an information processing method. However, William clearly does not disclose or suggest the specific information processing method (claim 8) and information processing system (claim 15) recited in independent claims 8 and 15, from which claims 11 and 16 respectively depend. Since William does not disclose or suggest the information processing method and information

processing system recited in claims 8 and 15, it does not cure the deficiencies of Panasik in view of Veerasamy.

Accordingly, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify the references to attain the claimed subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy and further in view of William be withdrawn.

Claims 28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik and Sato do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 28, 30 and 32.

Independent claim 28 is directed to an information processing system and requires a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for communicating with a base station by short-distance wireless communication to receive and send data information from and to the base station, the first information processing device having a display for displaying data information. Claim 28 further requires a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for communicating with the first wireless communicator by short-distance wireless communication

to receive and send data information from and to the first wireless communicator, the second information processing device having a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device when the first wireless communicator is communicating with the base station.

Thus independent claim 28 is directed to an information processing system having the following three components:

(1) A first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for communicating with a base station by short-distance wireless communication to receive and send data information from and to the base station;

(2) A display of the first information processing device for displaying the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station; and

(3) A second information processing device having a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device when the first wireless communicator is communicating with the base station (i.e., since the display of the first information device displays the data information which is received and sent from and to the base station, claim 28 also requires that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing



device is also data information which is received and sent from and to the base station).

The combined teachings of Panasik and Sato do not disclose or suggest the foregoing subject matter recited in independent claim 28.

The primary reference to Panasik discloses a low power wireless network as set forth above for the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Veerasamy. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Panasik does not disclose or suggest the combination of the foregoing components (1)-(3) recited in independent claim 28.

The secondary reference to Sato discloses a wireless communication system in which wireless communication units having different communication protocols communicate with a base unit. In the statement of rejection, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made "to combine Sato's teaching into Panasik's device so as to provide a wireless communication method over a short distance and a long distance, and to reduce communication cost". However, the statement of rejection does not specify which structure in Sato corresponds to or teaches the foregoing components (1)-(3) recited in independent claim 28. If the Examiner continues to maintain this rejection based on Sato, applicants

respectfully request that the Examiner specifically point out the structure and/or teaching in Sato corresponding to the foregoing components (1)-(3) recited in independent claim 28.

Nevertheless, applicants respectfully submit that Sato does not disclose or suggest the structural combination of the information processing system recited in independent claim 28. For example, while disclosing a wireless communication system in which wireless communication units having different communication protocols communicate with a base unit, Sato does not disclose or suggest a second information processing device having a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device (i.e., data information which is received and sent from and to the base station) when the first wireless communicator is communicating with the base station, as required by independent claim 28. Sato simply does not teach the specific display relationship between two of its wireless communication units and the base unit, as required by independent claim 28. Since Sato does not disclose or suggest the foregoing feature recited in independent claim 28, it does not cure the deficiencies of Panasik. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led modify the references to attain the claimed subject matter.

Claims 30 and 32 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claim 28 and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claim 28.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 28, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato be withdrawn.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of Prater. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik, Sato and Prater do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 29.

Panasik in view of Sato does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 28 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 28, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 29 depends on and contains all of the limitations of independent claim 28 and, therefore, distinguishes from the references at least in the same manner as claim 28.

Moreover, there is a separate ground for patentability of amended claim 29 which includes the additional limitation that the information processing system further comprises a battery for supplying power to the first

information processing device, and that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of the battery.

The secondary reference to Prater has been cited by the Examiner only for its disclosure of a communications transceiver in which information relating to a remaining charge of a battery of a processing device is displayed. However, Prater clearly does not disclose or suggest that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of the battery of the first information processing device. Stated otherwise, while Prater discloses the display of information relating to a remaining charge of a battery, there is no teaching basis in the reference to guide one skilled in the art to use a display of one information processing device to display the remaining charge of the battery of another information processing device, as required by claim 29. Since Prater does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 29, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of Prater to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of Prater be withdrawn.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of William. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik, Sato and William do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 31.

Panasik in view of Sato does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 28 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 28, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 31 depends on and contains all of the limitations of independent claim 28 and, therefore, distinguishes from the references at least in the same manner as claim 28.

The secondary reference to William has been cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of wrist-type watches. However, William does not disclose or suggest the structural combination of the information processing system recited in independent claim 28, from which claim 31 depends. Since William does not disclose or suggest the structural combination of the information processing system recited in independent claim 28, it does not cure the deficiencies of Panasik as modified by Sato. Accordingly, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify Panasik

in view of Sato and further in view of Prater to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Sato and further in view of William be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record also does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in newly added claims 33-43.

New claims 33-35, 36-43 and 44 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claims 15, 19 and 28, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 15, 19 and 28.

Moreover, there are separate grounds for patentability of several of new claims 33-44.

New claims 33 and 41 include the additional limitation that the information processing system further comprises input means for inputting to the second information processing device a display designation designating a display content to be displayed, display designation determination means for determining whether or not the display designation has been inputted, store determination means for determining whether or not the display content is stored in the second information processing device, transmission request means for requesting the first information processing device to transmit

the display content when the display content is not stored in the second information processing device, and means for causing the display of the second information processing device to display the display content when the display content is stored in the second information processing device or when the display content is transmitted by the first information processing device. This structural combination and corresponding functions are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

New claims 34, 35 and 42, 43 depend on claims 33 and 19, respectively, and are directed to the specific structure of the input means. Claims 36-37 depend on claim 19 and are directed to the specific structure of the first information processing device. Again no corresponding structure is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Claim 44 depends on claim 28 and includes the additional limitation that the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device comprises first level information, and that the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device comprises second level information corresponding to a sub-level of the first level information. No corresponding feature is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record as set forth above for allowable claim 19 claim 10, and amended claim 23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and discussion,  
the application is believed to be in allowable form.  
Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the  
claims are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
ADAMS & WILKS

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams  
Reg. No. 25,386

50 Broadway - 31st Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
MS FEE AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria,  
VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Debra Buonincontri

Name

Debra Buonincontri

Signature

December 22, 2003

Date